

REMARKS

The Official Action dated February 7, 2006 has been received and its contents carefully noted. In view thereof, claims 1, 10, 11, 12 and 19 have been amended in order to better define that which Applicant regards as the invention. As previously, claims 1-5, 7-14 and 16-20 are presently pending in the instant application.

Initially, Applicant wishes to acknowledge the Examiner's indication that claims 10, 17 and 18 are allowable over the prior art of record while claims 1-5, 7-9, 19 and 20 have been objected to and claims 11, 12-14 and 16 have been indicated as being allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph set forth in the Office Action. In this regard, as can be seen from the forgoing amendments, those instances of indefiniteness and informalities noted by the Examiner have been cured and consequently it is respectfully submitted that each of claims 1-5, 7-14 and 16-20 are now in proper formal condition for allowance.

With reference to the Official Action and particularly page 2 thereof, claims 1 and 19 have been objected to as including a minor informality. Particularly, the Examiner states that a second input terminal 10 and a second input terminal 20 as recited in each of claims 1 and 19 respectively is not clear. As can be seen from the foregoing amendments, each of claims 1 and 19 have been amended in order to correct the informality noted by the Examiner. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Applicant's claimed invention is now proper formal condition for allowance.

Further on page 2 of the Office Action, claims 11-14 and 16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the Examiner notes instances of indefiniteness in each of claims 11 and 12. As noted

hereinabove, each of claims 11 and 12 have been amended in order to correct those instances of indefiniteness noted by the Examiner. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Applicant's claimed invention is now in proper formal condition for allowance.

Therefore, in view of the foregoing it is respectfully requested that the objections and rejections of record be reconsidered and withdrawn by the Examiner, that claims 1-5, 7-14 and 16-20 be allowed and that the application be passed to issue.

Should the Examiner believe a conference would be of benefit in expediting the prosecution of the instant application, he is hereby invited to telephone counsel to arrange such a conference.

Respectfully submitted,



Donald R. Studebaker
Reg. No. 32,815

Nixon Peabody LLP
401 9th Street N.W.
Suite 900
Washington, D. C. 20004
(202) 585-8000